

REMARKS

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant understands this rejection to be related to the pluralization of the term "color channel" in the claim when the antecedent reference in the claim is singular. Applicant corrected this error through strikeout of the "s" in "channels" in the last response, however, the strikeout does not show up well over a single letter "s." A close inspection of the last response may correct this problem. Applicant also authorizes the examiner to correct this error by replacing any plural occurrences of the word "channels" with the singular word "channel."

Claims 14, 15, 18 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 US 102(e) as being anticipated by US Published Patent Application No. 2003/0164961 to Daly (hereinafter Daly).

Claims 14, 21, 22 and 23 are independent. Claims 15 and 18 are dependent on claim 14.

This rejection is improper because the cited prior art reference is not an invention by another. Since Daly is the sole inventor of cited reference and is one of two inventors in the rejected application, it is apparent that "any invention disclosed, but not claimed in the copending application was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention 'by another'." A declaration under 37 CFR §1.132 can be filed, but the facts that would be averred therein are already apparent due to the sole inventorship of the cited reference.

Appl. No. 10/645,952
Response Dated March 18, 2011
Reply to Office Action of November 18, 2010

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 US 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Published Patent Application No. 2003/0164961 to Daly (hereinafter Daly) in view of US Patent No. 4,758,893 to Lippel (hereinafter Lippel).

Claim 14 is independent. Claim 16 is dependent on claim 14. This rejection is also improper as the cited prior art, Daly, and the current application were subject to an obligation of assignment to the same entity at the time of invention. Both applications were assigned to Sharp Laboratories of America, Inc. at the time of invention. The assignment of the present application is recorded at Reel/Frame: 014425/0393. The assignment of the cited reference is recorded at Reel/Frame: 012566/0006.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 US 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Published Patent Application No. 2003/0164961 to Daly (hereinafter Daly) in view of US Patent No. 7,110,010 to Masuji (hereinafter Masuji).

Claim 14 is independent. Claim 17 is dependent on claim 14. This rejection is also improper as the cited prior art, Daly, and the current application were subject to an obligation of assignment to the same entity at the time of invention. Both applications were assigned to Sharp Laboratories of America, Inc. at the time of invention. The assignment of the present application is recorded at Reel/Frame: 014425/0393. The assignment of the cited reference is recorded at Reel/Frame: 012566/0006.

Claim 20 is allowable subject matter.

Appl. No. 10/645,952
Response Dated March 18, 2011
Reply to Office Action of November 18, 2010

Applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider this rejection in light of the above disclosure and statements.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott C. Krieger/
Scott C. Krieger
Reg. No. 42,768
Tel. No.: (360) 931-6406